

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 have been rejected. Claims 1-13 have been amended.

New claims 14-19 have been added in order to further define what the Applicants consider to be the invention. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-13 have been voluntarily amended for clarification only, as requested by the Examiner. These amendments are not being made for reasons of patentability. The amended claim is not subject to the complete bar against the use of the doctrine of equivalents as outlined in *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinsoku Kogyo Kapushiki Co., Ltd. a/ka/ SMC Corp. and Smt Pneumatics, Inc.*, as the amendments are not being made for reasons of patentability.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

Remarks to the Drawings

Fig. 1 has been amended to match the specification and to correct a typographical error. Specifically, in Figure 1, previously omitted element 9 has been added. The entire drawing sheet containing the corrected drawing is enclosed for review by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the drawings add no new matter.

Remarks to the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner suggested adding headings to the specification. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's suggestion, however respectfully decline to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a), and could be inappropriately used in interpreting the specification.

Double Patenting Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 12 and 13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of US Patent publication 2006/0257006.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

US Patent publication 2006/0257006 ("the '006 publication") was filed as PCT/IB04/51452 on August 12, 2004, and thus the effective US filing date of the '006 publication is August 12, 2004. In contrast, the present application was filed as PCT/IB04/051446 on August 11, 2004, and therefore has an effective US filing date one day earlier than the '006 publication. Accordingly, the '006 publication is not available prior art for double patenting purposes against the present application and an obviousness-type double patenting rejection is inappropriate. Indeed, should both applications issue with their present claims, a patent to the present application would expire one day earlier than a patent to the '006 publication.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection based on obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-13 because of alleged informalities. Applicants have amended claims 1-13 in order to cure these informalities. Reference characters have been removed from claims 1-13. Exemplary language has been removed from claims 8 and 10. Language containing "and/or," "preferably," "especially," and "optionally" has been removed from claims 1, 3, 6 and 11-13. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these objections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Packer *et al.* (US 6,556,695). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Packer *et al.* do not disclose "the estimated position of the object in the map image being brought into register...only a section of the map image being used" as recited in amended independent claims 1, 12 and 13. This is not disclosed in col. 10, lines 31-26 of Packer *et al.*, which purportedly describes the overlay of an image with an "icon that represents the device, or simply a cursor or cross-hairs." Packer *et al.*, col. 10, lines 31-26. For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Packer *et al.* cannot anticipate claims 1, 12 and 13 as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claims 1, 12 and 13 are allowable. Claims 2-11 depend from, directly or indirectly, claims 1, 12 and 13, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-11 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claims 1, 12 and 13 and to claims 2-11 dependent thereon.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-13.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

APPLICANT(S): ECK et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/568,479
FILED: February 15, 2006
Page 10

Respectfully submitted,

s/Brian L. Wamsley/

Brian L. Wamsley
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,045

for Christopher M. Ries, Reg. No. 45,799
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9632
Facsimile: 914-332-0615

Dated: January 7, 2008